

REMARKS

The Official Action of October 4, 2004, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. Claim 1 remains in the application for consideration, and this claim defines patentable subject matter warranting its allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Menke '185. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection especially as applied to claim 1 as amended.

As the Examiner will note, claim 1 has been amended to specifically locate anti-panic spring 36 between lock lever 30 and movable member 35 on the same single common shaft 31 on which both lock lever 30 and movable member 35 rotate. In Menke, lock lever 18 and movable member 20 are engaged on two spaced apart and separate shafts rather than the same single common shaft as claimed. Further, while anti-panic spring 21 of Menke is engaged between lock lever 18 and movable member 20, it is not engaged on the same single common shaft as claimed.

Clearly, the arrangement of the lock lever movable member and anti-panic spring claimed by Applicant results in a far more compact and unique structure than that of Menke.

Appln. No. 10/693,692
Amdt. dated April 4, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated October 4, 2004

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of
applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The prior art documents made of record and not
relied upon have been noted along with the implication that
such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently
pertinent to warrant their applications against any of
applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Norman J. Latker

Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\N\Niiz\Watanabe29\Pto\Amendment-A.doc